



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 9, 2004

Ms. Moira Parro  
Assistant District Attorney  
Dallas County  
411 Elm Street  
Dallas, Texas 75202

OR2004-0970

Dear Ms. Parro:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 195998.

The County of Dallas (the "county") received a request for information relating to (1) the contractual relationship between the county and Gila Corporation d/b/a Municipal Bureau Services ("MSB") for a specified time period and (2) documents produced by the county in response to previous open records requests made by a specified individual and on behalf of any media outlet. You state that the county will release some responsive information but claim that release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of a third party under section 552.110 of the Government Code, although you take no position as to whether the information is so excepted. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified MSB of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Public Information Act (the "Act") in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information, as well as arguments submitted to this office by MSB.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> MSB also submitted their own information, which differs slightly from the proposal submitted by the county. As the county did not submit these materials, this ruling does not address the public nature of such materials. Rather, this ruling only addresses the info submitted to this office by the county.

You acknowledge that the county failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in asking for this decision. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply not later than the tenth business day after the date of receiving the written request. Additionally, pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. You state that the county received the present request on October 17, 2003. The county did not request a decision from this office or submit the required materials until November 24, 2003. Consequently, the county failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Generally speaking, a compelling reason exists when third party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Because third party interests are at stake in this instance, we will address the third party's arguments. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977).

MSB asserts that the employee information included in the submitted proposal is excepted from disclosure under section 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]" This exception is applicable only to information contained in the personnel file of an employee of a governmental body. *See Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision Nos. 473 at 3 (1987), 444 at 3-4 (1986), 423 at 2 (1984). As MSB's personnel information does not relate to governmental employees, section 552.102 is inapplicable to MSB's information, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

MSB contends that portions of the submitted proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the property

interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

We find that MSB has established the applicability of section 552.110(a) with regards to the portions of the proposal that we have marked. However, we find that MSB has established the applicability of neither section 552.110(a) nor section 552.110(b) to any remaining portion of the submitted proposal. Therefore, the county may not withhold the remaining portions of the submitted proposal under section 552.110.

MSB also contends that portions of the submitted proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.139 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> This section provides:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if it is information that relates to computer network security or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

(b) The following information is confidential:

(1) a computer network vulnerability report; and

(2) any other assessment of the extent to which data processing operations, a computer program, network, system, or software of a governmental body or of a contractor of a governmental body is vulnerable to unauthorized access or

---

<sup>2</sup> Although MSB raises section 552.136 of the Government Code concerning information related to security issues for computers, the 78<sup>th</sup> Legislature recently renumbered that provision as section 552.139. *See* Act of May 21, 2003, 78th Leg., R.S., ch. 1275, § 2(76), 2003 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 4144 (to be codified at Gov’t Code § 552.139).

harm, including an assessment of the extent to which the governmental body's or contractor's electronically stored information is vulnerable to alteration, damage, or erasure.

Act of May 21, 2003, 78th Leg., R.S., ch. 1275, § 2(76), 2003 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 4814 (Vernon) (to be codified at Gov't Code § 552.139). Section 552.139(a), however, is intended to protect only the interests of a governmental body in its computer network information. As the county does not raise section 552.139 and the information does not involve the county's computer network information, this section does not apply to the requested information. Upon review, we also determine that MSB has not demonstrated that any portion of the submitted proposal constitutes a computer network vulnerability assessment or report as contemplated in section 552.139(b). Consequently, the county may not withhold any portion of the submitted proposal under section 552.139.

In summary, the county may withhold the marked portions of the submitted information under section 552.110(a). The remaining submitted information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Amy D. Peterson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ADP/sdk

Ref: ID# 195998

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Thomas S. Goggan, III  
Linebarger, Goggan, Blair & Sampson, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 17428  
Austin, Texas 78760  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Richard L. Butler  
Vice President  
Municipal Services Bureau  
5912 Balcones Drive  
Austin, Texas 78731  
(w/o enclosures)